

**REMARKS**

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed October 5, 2006. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-47, and 51-53 were pending in this Application. No claims have been cancelled, claim 1 has been amended, and no new claims have been added. Thus, Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-47, and 51-53 are currently pending in this Application.

Claim 1 has been amended to add an "and" which was mistakenly deleted in the last amendment. No new matter is intended or believed to be added by this amendment.

**I. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-7, 8, 10-14, 15, 17-21, and 51-53 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In making this rejection, the Examiner stated that "the claim language, 'without affecting repository settings,' renders the claims, when taken as a whole, indefinite because it is difficult for the Examiner and the public to determine the metes and bounds of the claimed invention. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertion.

In construing the meaning of a claim limitation, it is entirely proper to look to the specification in order to interpret what the inventor intended by the claim term. In re

*Sneed*, 710 F.2d. 1544, 1548, 218 U.S.P.Q. 385, 388 (Fed. Cir. 1983) ("It is axiomatic that, in proceedings before the PTO, claims in an application are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification, . . . , and that claim language should be read in light of the specification as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art."); *In re Marosi*, 710 F.2d 799, 802-03, 218 U.S.P.Q. 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983) ("It is well established that 'claims are not to be read in a vacuum, and limitations therein are to be read in light of the specification . . . .'"); *In re Ehrreich*, 590 F.2d 902, 907, 200 U.S.P.Q. 504, 508 (CCPA 1979).

The specification as filed states, beginning on page 16 at line 18:

A channel **610** is a useful abstraction representing one or more remote host computers. It is intended to free the repository contributors from thinking about the physical deployment of documents and concentrate instead on writing and categorization. The channels also allow technical staff the flexibility to change the names or configurations of remote hosts without affecting repository settings. This is a chief consideration considering that in a large enterprise, this might not be the same technical staff responsible for the repository.

The value of the channel concept becomes clear when you consider clustered environments where multiple computers are fronted by a switch or "load balancer" to provide high availability and fail over. Without channels, the repository software, or worse yet, the repository user would be

expected to know the physical machine names (and directories) to send a finished copy of the document. Clearly this is not reasonable and is likely to be error prone.

Thus, it is clear that the phrase "without affecting the repository setting", which is found in claims 1, 8, and 15, is not indefinite, but, rather, is quite clear - it means that the names or confirmations of remote hosts, e.g., the physical machines, can be changed without affecting the ability of the method to perform adequately. Therefore, claims 1, 8, and 15 are not indefinite. Consequently, the dependent claims 3-7, 10-14, 17-21, and 51-53 which depend from respective ones of claims 1, 8, and 15 are not indefinite as well.

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 3-7, 8, 10-14, 15, 17-21, and 51-53 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, has been overcome.

**II. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17-19, 21-47, and 51-53)**

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17-19, 21-47, and 51-53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tripp et al. ("Tripp"), U.S. Patent No. 6,976,053. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In making this rejection, the Examiner stated that "the Tripp system teaches that the repository settings and functions can operate seamlessly even when the names and configurations of the remote hosts are changed (i.e., deleted, modified, et.)."

(Office Action dated October 5, 2006, page 5). However, the Examiner does not cite any particular section of Tripp for this proposition. The Applicant has reviewed Tripp closely and can find no teaching or suggestion for such a feature as "wherein the names and configurations of the one or more remote hosts may be changed without affecting repository settings" as recited in claim 1 of the present application. Tripp is a long and complex reference comprising 26 pages. If the Examiner believes that such a feature is taught by Tripp, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point out with specificity the appropriate section of Tripp that demonstrates the Examiner's assertions so that the Applicant can make an appropriate traversal or amendment.

The Examiner also states that "Tripp suggests (see Abstract and col. 10 lines 5-27: Tripp teaches wherein the metadata comprises channel information (i.e., categorization information) detailing which of a plurality of channels the document is to be copied to where the channel represents at least one of the remote storage devices)." (Office Action dated October 5, 2006, page 5). The specification of the present application states on page 16 at line 18-19 that a "channel **610** is a useful abstraction representing one or more remote host computers." However, neither the Abstract of Tripp nor the column 10, lines 5-27 of Tripp mention, let alone teach or suggest, the inclusion of channels by name or even under a different functionally equivalent name. The Examiner's apparent identification of a channel as "categorization information" is incorrect, incomplete, and misleading and ignores the definition provided

by the Applicant in the specification. Using the Applicant's definition of "channel" as provided in the specification of the present application as filed, it is clear that Tripp nowhere teaches or suggests the use or inclusion of a channel or its functional equivalent.

Therefore, claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Tripp. Claims 8 and 15 contain similar limitations to claim 1 and are therefore not rendered obvious by Tripp under the rationale provided above for claim 1. Furthermore, claims 3-5, 7, 10-12, 14, 17-19, 21, and 52-53 depend from respective ones of claims 1, 8, and 15. Therefore, the same arguments in support of patentability provided for claims 1, 8, and 15 above apply for claims 3-5, 7, 10-12, 14, 17-19, 21, and 51-53 as well. Therefore, claims 1, 305, 7, 10-12, 14, 17-19, 21, and 51-53 are not rendered obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103 by Tripp.

Claims 22 and 40 include the limitation of channel information. This limitation is not taught or suggested by Tripp as pointed out above with reference to claim 1. Claims 28 and 34 contain similar limitations to claim 22 and the same arguments apply. Therefore, claims 22, 28, 34, and 40 are not rendered obvious by Tripp. Claims 23-27, 29-33, 35-39, and 41-47 depend from respective ones of claims 22, 28, 34, and 40. Therefore, the same arguments in support of patentability presented for claims 22, 28, 34, and 40 apply to claims 23-27, 29-33, 35-39, and 41-47. Thus, claims 22-47 are not rendered obvious by Tripp.

Other deficiencies in Tripp exist but the foregoing is sufficient to distinguish the claims of the present application from the teachings and suggestions of Tripp.

Therefore the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-12, 14, 15, 17-19, 21-47, and 51-53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome.

**III. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Claims 6, 13, and 20)**

The Examiner rejected Claims 6, 13, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Tripp et al. ("Tripp"), U.S. Patent No. 6,976,053 in view of Cooney, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0107700. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6, 13, and 20 depend from claims 1, 7, and 15 respectively. Therefore, the same deficiencies found in Tripp as it relates to claims 1, 7, and 15 apply to claims 6, 13, and 20. These deficiencies are not cured by any teaching or suggestion found in Cooney nor does the Examiner suggest that they are. Therefore, claims 6, 13, and 20 are not rendered obvious by Tripp in view of Cooney.

Thus the rejection of claims 6, 13, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the Application is in condition for allowance, and Applicant earnestly seeks such allowance of Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-47, and 51-53. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions in furtherance of the prosecution of this Application, please contact Applicant's attorney at 214.999.4344. Applicant, through its attorney, stands ready to conduct a telephone interview with the Examiner to review this Application if the Examiner believes that such an interview would assist in the advancement of this Application.

To the extent that any further fees are required during the pendency of this Application, including petition fees, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees, including, without limitation, any fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or 37 C.F.R. § 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 07-0153 of Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP and reference Attorney Docket No. 119166.1002. In the event that any additional time is needed for this filing, or any additional time in excess of that requested in a petition for an extension of time, please consider this a petition for an extension of time for any needed extension of time pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 or any other section or provision of Title 37. Applicant respectfully requests that the Commissioner grant any such petition and authorize the Commissioner to charge the Deposit Account referenced above. Please credit any overpayments to this same Deposit Account.

Attorney Docket No. 119166.1002  
Customer No. 38851

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE  
SERIAL NO. 10/613,140

24

This is intended to be a complete response to the Office  
Action mailed October 5, 2006.

Please direct all correspondence to the practitioner listed  
below at Customer No. 38851.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen R. Loe  
Registration No. 43,757

Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP  
Thanksgiving Tower  
1601 Elm Street, Suite 3000  
Dallas, Texas 75201-4761  
Telephone: 214.999.4344  
Facsimile: 214.999.3344  
Email: sloe@gardere.com

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

[January 5, 2007]